

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement (PEMS)

Documents pour l'Histoire du Français Langue Étrangère ou Seconde – DHFLES follows the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (COPE), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) and the Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA), that have collaborated to identify principles of transparency and best practice for scholarly publications and requires its collaborators to respect the Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers drawn up by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Any cases of ethical misconduct are treated seriously and will be dealt with in accordance with the COPE guidelines. The following statements are inspired by these guidelines.

Background

Documents pour l'Histoire du Français Langue Étrangère ou Seconde – DHFLES - is a journal devoted to research into the history of French as a foreign and/or second language, as well as other languages and their teaching in a context of plurilingualism. It is published by the SIHFLES, a society which includes researchers from several European countries, as well as from Africa, North America and Asia (<https://www.sihfiles.org/la-revue-documents/>).

The aim of the journal is to publish articles on the various themes associated with this research field (institutions, textbooks, legislation, teaching methods, materials, literary productions, public, etc.). In the long term, its relevance should lead to a better understanding of these themes. The journal is grateful to authors for submitting their articles, which must comply with the ethical recommendations for publication and deal with a subject in one of the fields indicated. The Editorial Board is responsible for selecting articles on the basis of their scientific quality and the relevance of the research to the field covered by the journal. Respecting the ethical charter of transparency, it ensures that manuscripts are improved and that ethical recommendations are respected. Each issue is assigned to one coordinator, who is responsible for formatting the articles and liaising with the reviewers. The coordinator works in a spirit of goodwill and in compliance with the ethical guidelines, ensuring that manuscripts are suitable and that the recommendations are respected.

Principles of transparency and good publication practice for the DHFLES journal

According to the recommendations of the COPE (Committee On Publication Ethics-Code of Conduct) (https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf) and Core Practices (<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>)

1. The journal *Documents pour l'Histoire du Français Langue Étrangère ou Seconde* (DHFLES) has a scientific committee (27 members) and an editorial committee (5 members) both renewed every 4 years. The process of submitting articles for publication involves a first reading by the issue coordinator, proofreading and a double-blind review by experts who are members of the scientific committee. This is followed by a proofreading by the editorial committee, who ensure the scientific and formal conformity of the manuscript. The Editorial Board ensures compliance with the journal's standards and "recommendations to authors", helping to improve the quality of articles by providing authors with advice when necessary.
2. The evaluation procedure is described on the journal's website, under the heading: Article evaluation procedure (<https://journals.openedition.org/dhfles/6130>).

3. The functions and contact details of the various members of the Scientific Committee (<https://journals.openedition.org/dhfles/6122>) and the Editorial Committee are available on the journal's website (<https://journals.openedition.org/dhfles/7247>).
4. The submission of articles to DHFLES is free of charge for authors.
5. Texts intended for publication are the property of the DHFLES journal, which holds the copyright.
6. The Scientific and Editorial Boards of the DHFLES journal are committed to be vigilant with regard to any research articles that do not comply with the recommendations of good ethical conduct. Each stage from submission to publication is considered carefully with regard to possible plagiarism, manipulation or falsification of data. When informed of a submission and/or publication that does not comply with the above-mentioned recommendations, the journal undertakes to follow the normal procedure, as specified on the website.
7. The DHFLES journal website (<https://www.sihfles.org/la-revue-documents/>) meets the requirements of publication ethics. The various documents relating to the journal's ethical charter are available on the website: 'Procedure for evaluating articles and recommendations to authors, Publications Ethics and Malpractice Statement'.
8. The title of the journal is unique.
9. DHFLES undertakes to declare any conflicts of interest involving editors, authors and reviewers.
10. The DHFLES journal is published each year in December. Issues 1 to 22 can be consulted on Persée (<https://www.persee.fr/collection/docum>). From issue 23 onwards, they are published by OpenEdition (<https://journals.openedition.org/dhfles/>).

Ethical principles for peer reviewers

[Basic principles to which peer reviewers adhere]

General ethical principles of peer review

1. To agree to review an article (free of charge), the reviewer must be an expert in the subject and must be able to complete the review within the allotted time.
2. The rules of confidentiality regarding the article and its review apply to the reviewer during and after the review until publication in the DHFLES journal.
3. The data in the article may not be used by the reviewer or by a member of their research team. These data may not be used to denigrate the reviewer or their team.
4. Reviewers must declare any potential conflict of interest (personal, financial, professional, political, religious, etc.). If in doubt, they should seek advice from the journal. They must not be influenced by commercial considerations or by the following characteristics: nationality, ethnicity, religion, political commitment, gender identity, etc.
5. The evaluation/review must be as objective and constructive as possible. It must aim at benevolent neutrality and must not reflect the mood of the assessors/reviewers (animosity or enthusiasm).
6. The assessors/reviewers must be aware that their work is an interactive process of quality improvement. They undertake to provide DHFLES with accurate personal and

professional information and an accurate description of their expertise. Impersonation during the review process is considered a serious offence.

During the reviewer selection procedure

1. Reviewers are asked to accept the task only if they are confident that they can complete it within the given timeframe, usually within the following month. They are asked to inform the journal promptly if they require additional time, which will then be negotiated with the journal.
2. They are asked to refuse to carry out the assessment if they cannot guarantee to do so within the allotted time. They are asked to inform the DHFLES journal if they consider that they do not have the expertise required to evaluate all or part of the article and if they are likely to be in a situation of professional conflict of interest. This includes: having worked in the same research team as the authors, applying to work in their research team, having collaborated on work with the authors. For example, having had a hierarchical relationship with them (doctoral student, master's degree, etc.) during the previous three years constitutes a professional conflict of interest.
3. They may not agree to do an assessment/review for the sole benefit of their curriculum vitae and must refuse to do so if they were involved in all or part of the research or if they are preparing a similar article. If they are not comfortable with the DHFLES review process and/or are unable to produce an unbiased review, they should decline to review.
4. Reviewers undertake to produce a new review for an article that they have been asked to review for another journal; the submitted text may in fact have been modified and the other journal may have different criteria for accepting or rejecting an article.

Respective responsibilities: publisher, editors, reviewers, authors

Responsibilities of the editors

1. The editors undertake to carry out their duties with respect for authors, without discrimination based on, sexual orientation and/or gender identity, religious or political beliefs, ethnic or geographical origin. The editors undertake to use the same procedure for all article submissions, whether in response to a call for publication or spontaneously. Acceptance must depend on the academic quality of the manuscript and not on any personal or commercial gain.
2. The editors undertake to respond to any complaints of an ethical nature and to any possible conflicts in accordance with the ethical charter and procedure of the DHFLES journal. All complaints will be responded to after investigation, regardless of when the original publication was approved. Documentation associated with such complaints will be retained.

Responsibilities of reviewers

The assessors/proof-readers undertake to assess the manuscript and to improve its quality by means of educational and objective proofreading, carried out within the given deadlines. They are bound by the confidentiality of the information provided by the DHFLES journal. They undertake not to copy the manuscript, not to use all or part of the manuscript and to alert the journal if they think the authors have not respected its ethical charter; this is particularly the case where a manuscript is suspected of plagiarism or of having already been published. Reviewers undertake to inform the journal of any potential conflict of interest between the reviewer and the authors, whether financial, institutional, hierarchical, or collaborative. They may ask to be relieved of this evaluation/review in view of the said conflict.

Authors' responsibilities

1. Originality and plagiarism. Authors ensure that they have written and submitted only entirely original works, and that if they have used the work and/or words of others, these have been appropriately quoted. They also ensure that their proposal is without prejudice to the rights of legal entities or natural persons. Authors undertake to make available the data associated with the submitted manuscript. When submitting, authors certify that the manuscript is original and has not been published or accepted for publication in any other journal.
2. Authorship. The corresponding author ensures that all appropriate co-authors, who made significant contributions to the conception or interpretation of the study - and no inappropriate co-authors - are included in the author list and verify that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to its submission for publication. All persons who made substantial contributions to the work but who do not meet the criteria for authorship can be acknowledged in the "Acknowledgements" section.
3. If part of the manuscript has already been published or accepted elsewhere, the authors undertake to provide DHFLES with a copy of this publication, to provide permission for its use and to cite their sources. After review, the journal retains the right to refuse a submission if the content is deemed to be too similar or too closely related. The DHFLES journal is subject to the following Creative commons licence: Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0).
4. Authors undertake to declare any conflicts of interest detailed in the ethical charter of the DHFLES journal. Authors undertake to inform the journal as soon as possible, if a significant error in their publication is identified. Authors undertake to cooperate with the editorial board in publishing an erratum, addendum, correction or even in withdrawing the article, if this proves necessary.
5. Fundamental errors in published works. When authors discover significant errors or inaccuracies in their own published work, it is their obligation to promptly notify the journal's editors and cooperate with them either to correct the paper in the form of an erratum or to retract the paper. If the editors or publisher learn from a third party that a published work contains a significant error or inaccuracy, then it is the authors' obligation to promptly correct or retract the paper or provide evidence to the journal editors of its accuracy.
6. Digital publication. Authors allow the journal to distribute their paper in digital form, in particular via Cairn.info and OpenEdition Journals.

Procedures in the event of a breach of the ethics charter and/or recommendations

Identification of non-compliance with the ethics charter and/or recommendations

1. DHFLES asks anyone who identifies a breach of the charter and/or guidelines to report it to them. The journal undertakes to respond to any queries regarding possible breaches of an ethical nature. All allegations of breaches of the charter and/or recommendations will be taken into account by the journal, provided that they contain sufficient information or evidence for an investigation to be carried out.
2. In addition to the editing work carried out by the Editorial Board and the reviewers, which ensures that the texts intended for publication comply with editorial standards (<https://www.sihfles.org/la-revue-documents/recommandations-aux-auteurs/>) and the scientific and ethical criteria mentioned above, the texts are sent back to the authors for a final revision before being published online.

The journal's website has an e-mail address for comments or allegations of any kind (infosihfles@gmail.com), which are to be sent to the editorial board for follow-up and possible corrections.